

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. The basis for the amended claims may be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims of the original application, and no new matter is entered. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1, 5, 6, 9 of copending Application No. 10/460,196. The rejections of "Double patenting" are respectfully requested to be withdrawn at least in view of the reasons provided below.

In view of both the present invention and the Application No. 10/460,196, Claim 1 of both applications claims a testing method for the circuits of an AMOLED. In the present invention, the circuit in Claim 1 comprises two transistors and the arrangement thereof, and on the other hand, in the Application No. 10/460,196, the circuit in Claim 1 comprises a test element. That is to say, the present invention doesn't need a test element, which could worsen the efficiency of the circuit by shunting the current. In addition, the circuit in the Application No. 10/460,196 doesn't need to comprise two transistors arranged as in the present invention.

Furthermore, in the testing method of Claim 1 of the present invention, a signal is extracted directly from the test output terminal which is the drain or the source of the transistor in the circuit, without connecting any other test elements. However, in the Application No. 10/460,196, the signal flowing through the test element cannot be measured directly by extracting the signal from one terminal of the test element, because the signal will be shunted by an extractor and the test element. Therefore, the Application No. 10/460,196 needs another way to measure the signal flowing through the test element, for example, adding a measurement device serially connected to the test element as the specification of the Application No.10/460,196 disclosed.

Therefore, the scopes of Claims 1 in the present invention and in the Application No. 10/460,196 are substantially patentably distinct, and in the same reasoning, the scopes of Claim 4 in the present invention and Claim 9 in the Application No. 10/460,196 are also substantially patentably distinct. The Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 4 are non-obvious in view of claims 1, 5, 6, and 9 of Application No. 10/460,196 and consequently are allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 2, 3 which directly or indirectly depend on Claim 1 are also be patentable.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner asserts that Claims 1, 3 and 4 are anticipated and, therefore, not patentable in view of prior art of Tai reference (U.S. patent No. 2002/0014851). Claims 1, 3 and 4 are patentable over Tai reference at least for the reasons provided below.

According to specification and figures of Tai et al., the method for testing an OLED array includes the test of an OLED and the test of a circuit. In other words, the test is posterior to the implantation of the OLED. If a circuit fails during the test, the OLED having been implanted in it is wasted and cannot be recovered even though the OLED itself is perfect. However, as amended, independent Claims 1 and 4 recite the method and the system for testing circuits of an AMOLED prior to the implantation of OLED, consequently reducing the production cost of failing OLED.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation of Tai et al. to form Applicant's invention, because, contrary to the teaching of Tai et al., the present invention includes a circuit test that is prior to implantation of the OLEDs.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner asserts that Claim 2 is obvious and, therefore, not patentable in view of prior art of the Tai reference (U.S. patent No. 2002/0014851).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amended claims.


As described above, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, and 4 are allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 2 and 3 which directly or indirectly depend on patentable Claims 1, and 4, and further limit the scope, are believed also to be patentable for the reasons set forth above, namely, the prior art does not teach or suggest a method for testing AMOLED circuits, which includes a step of extracting a signal from a test output prior to implantation of the OLED.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that pending Claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: April 1, 2005

By: 
Cynthia L. Pillote
Reg. No. 42,999

SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
TEL 602-382-6296
FAX 602-382-6070
cpillote@swlaw.com